UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/077,624	02/14/2002	Wenyuan Shi	061818-5512 US	2797

43850 7590 06/06/2006

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP (SF)
2 PALO ALTO SQUARE
3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700
PALO ALTO, CA 94306

EXAMINER	
ZEMAN, ROBERT A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1645	

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/077,624	SHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert A. Zeman	1645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 December 2005 and 06 March 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-48* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *2-20,24-26,28 and 30-48* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,21-23,27 and 29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *14 February 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2-14-02, 4-[illegible]03, 11-17-05*
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group IV (wherein the antimicrobial peptide moiety is Novispirin 10 and the target organism is *Psuedomonas*) in the replies filed on 12-5-2005 and 3-6-2006 are acknowledged.

Claims 1-48 are pending. Claims 2-20, 24-26, 28 and 30-48 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Claims 1, 21-23, 27 and 29 are currently under examination.

Priority

Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120 as follows:

The later-filed application must be an application for a patent for an invention which is also disclosed in the prior application (the parent or original nonprovisional application or provisional application). The disclosure of the invention in the parent application and in the later-filed application must be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. See *Transco Products, Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc.*, 38 F.3d 551, 32 USPQ2d 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

The disclosure of the prior-filed application, Application No. 09/910,358, fails to provide adequate support or enablement in the manner provided by the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112

for one or more claims of this application. Specifically, the prior filed application does not disclose the use of Novispirin G10 or SEQ ID NO:17 of the instant application. Consequently, the filing date of the instant application (2-14-2002) will be used for prior art purposes.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Information Disclosure Statements filed on 2-14-2002, 4-3-2003 and 11-17-2005 have been considered. Initialed copies are attached hereto. Not all the cited references were available and hence were not considered. Said references will be considered as they become available.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 21-23, 27 and 29 are objected to as being drawn, in part, to non-elected inventions. Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 1, 23, 27 and 29 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1, 21, 24 and 26 of copending Application No. 10/706,391. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 21 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 20 of copending Application No. 10/706,391. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both claim sets are drawn to compositions comprising a targeting moiety and an anti-microbial peptide moiety wherein said anti-microbial peptide moiety is Novispirin 10 and the target microbial organism is a *Pseudomonas* species.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 23, 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Said claims recite language drawn to non-elected inventions making it impossible to determine the metes and bounds of the claimed inventions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 21-23, 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehrer et al. (U.S. Patent 6,492,328) in view of Goldenberg (U.S. Patent 5,332,627).

The instant claims are drawn to compositions comprising a targeting moiety and an anti-microbial peptide moiety wherein the targeting moiety is coupled to the anti-microbial; the targeting moiety is specific for a *Pseudomonas* species; and the anti-microbial peptide moiety is Novispirin G10 (optionally with the sequence of SEQ ID NO:17).

Lehrer et al. disclose the use of Novispirin G10 to treat bacterial infections, fungal infections and protozoan infections (see column 6, lines 16-39). Lehrer et al. further disclose Novispirins, generally, and Novispirin G10 specifically, are particularly useful for killing *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (see column 5, lines 55-57 and Figure 2).

Lehrer et al. differs from the instant invention in that they don't explicitly disclose the use of Novispirin G10 coupled to a targeting moiety.

Goldenberg discloses the use of immunoconjugates to treat microbial infections wherein said immunoconjugate comprises an antibody or antibody fragment coupled to a therapeutic agent (see column 2, lines 37-57). Goldenberg further discloses that antimicrobial agents can be used to treatment of bacterial infections (see column 3, lines 7-17) and that the term "microbe" encompasses bacteria (see column 3, line 24). Finally, Goldenberg discloses the use of antibody conjugates allows the localization of the therapeutic agent at the target site (i.e. the site of infection) with a higher efficiency and an enhanced target to non-target ratio (see column 3, lines

55-58). This would reduce the amount of antimicrobial agent required to treat a given infection and thereby reducing any toxicity associated with said agent.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the antibody conjugate system disclosed by Goldenberg as the delivery vehicle for the Novispirin G10 disclosed by Lehrer et al. in treating a *Pseudomonas* infection in order to take advantage of the increased target site delivery efficiency associated with Goldenberg's conjugates.

One would have a reasonable expectation of success since Goldenberg discloses a multitude of antimicrobial agents can be used in his conjugates.

Claims 1, 21-23, 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehrer et al. (U.S. Patent 6,492,328) in view of Shi et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2004/0052814A1).

The instant claims are drawn to compositions comprising a targeting moiety and an anti-microbial peptide moiety wherein the targeting moiety is coupled to the anti-microbial; the targeting moiety is specific for a *Pseudomonas* species; and the anti-microbial peptide moiety is Novispirin G10 (optionally with the sequence of SEQ ID NO:17).

Lehrer et al. disclose the use of Novispirin G10 to treat bacterial infections, fungal infections and protozoan infections (see column 6, lines 16-39). Lehrer et al. further disclose Novispirins, generally, and Novispirin G10 specifically, are particularly useful for killing *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (see column 5, lines 55-57 and Figure 2).

Lehrer et al. differs from the instant invention in that they don't explicitly disclose the use of Novispirin G10 coupled to a targeting moiety.

Shi et al. disclose the use of a fusion protein comprising a recognition sequence and an antimicrobial peptide to treat bacterial infections (see paragraph [0002]). Shi et al. further disclose that a multitude of different peptides can be used (see paragraph [0023]. Finally, Shi et al. disclose that their fusion proteins offer the advantage of targeted delivery of antimicrobial peptides that allows for a lower concentration of antimicrobial peptide to be administered thereby substantially reducing any side effects associated with the antimicrobial peptide (see paragraph [0030]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the fusion protein disclosed by Shi et al. the delivery vehicle for the Novispirin G10 disclosed by Lehrer et al. in treating a *Pseudomonas* infection in order to take advantage of the increased target site delivery efficiency associated with Shi's fusion proteins.

One would have a reasonable expectation of success since Shi et al. disclose a multitude of antimicrobial peptides can be used in their fusion proteins.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert A. Zeman whose telephone number is (571) 272-0866. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Thursday, 7am -5:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynette Smith can be reached on (571) 272-0864. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ROBERT ZEMAN
PATENT EXAMINER

May 25, 2006